

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 and 17-21 remain pending in the present application. Claims 8-16 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 2 and 7 have been amended. Claims 17-21 are new. Basis for the amendments and new claims can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings originally filed.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chipley (U.S. Pat. No. 2,329,102) in view of Saiki, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,693,173). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claim 1 has been amended to define a supply duct through which air from the air conditioner is supplied to the air passage in the ceiling wall. The holes in the ceiling wall are disposed such that a total area of the openings of the holes per unit area at a first position that is proximate an outlet end of the supply duct is smaller than that at a second position that is farther from the outlet end of the supply duct.

Chipley discloses a duct 3 having a plurality of holes, but as pointed out by the Examiner, Chipley does not disclose the total area relationship defined by Claim 1 of the present invention. The Examiner looks to Saiki, et al. to find the total area of the holes at a first position that is proximate to the end of duct 108 is smaller than that at a second position farther from the end of duct 108.

Reviewing the various figures of Saiki, et al. shows that the holes 106 located proximate to an outlet end (area a) of duct 108 are larger than the hole 106 located farther from the outlet end of duct 108 (area b & c). Therefore, Saiki, et al. discloses a

total area relationship that is exactly opposite to that which is now defined by amended Claim 1 of the present application.

Thus, Applicants believe Claim 1, as amended, patentably distinguishes over the cited art. Likewise, Claims 2, 3 and 7, which ultimately depend from Claim 1, are also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJOINDER

Applicants respectfully request the rejoinder of Claims 4-6. Claims 8-16 have been cancelled.

NEW CLAIMS

New Claims 17-21 are dependent claims which ultimately depend from Claim 1 and which Applicants believe properly further limit Claim 1. Applicants believe that new Claims 17-21 read on the elected species in this application.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the

Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 10, 2005

By:


Michael J. Schmidt, 34,007

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MJS/pmg